JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION

Vol. 43, No. 2 AMERICAN WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION April 2007

DEVELOPING NUTRIENT CRITERIA FOR STREAMS: AN EVALUATION OF THE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION METHOD[1]

Michael W. Suplee, Arun Varghese, and Joshua Cleland[2]

ABSTRACT: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency recommends two statistical methods to States and Tribes for developing nutrient criteria. One establishes a criterion as the 75th percentile of a reference-population frequency distribution, the other uses the 25th percentile of a general-population distribution; the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency suggests either method results in similar criteria. To evaluate each method, the Montana Department of Environmental Quality (MT DEQ) assembled data from STORET and other sources to create a nutrient general population. MT DEQ's reference-stream project provided reference population data. Data were partitioned by ecoregions, and by seasons (winter, runoff, and growing) defined for the project. For each ecoregion and season, nutrient concentrations at the 75th percentile of the reference population were matched to their corresponding concentrations in the general population. Additionally, nutrient concentrations from five regional scientific studies were matched to their corresponding reference population concentrations; each study linked nutrients to impacts on water uses. Reference-to-general population matches were highly variable between ecoregions, as nutrients at the 75th percentile of reference corresponded to percentiles ranging from the 4th to the 97th of the general population. In contrast, case studies-to-reference matches were more consistent, matching on average to the 86th percentile of reference, with a coefficient of variation of 13%.

(KEY TERMS: algae; rivers/streams; environmental regulations; nutrients.)

Suplee, Michael W., Arun Varghese, and Joshua Cleland, 2007. Developing Nutrient Criteria for Streams: An Evaluation of the Frequency Distribution Method. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* (JAWRA) 43(2):453-472. DOI: 10.1111/j.1752-1688.2007.00036.x

INTRODUCTION

The over enrichment of rivers and streams by nitrogen and phosphorus (eutrophication) is a serious water quality problem. Eutrophication can, for example, impact recreational and water supply uses (Freeman, 1986; Dodds *et al.*, 1997), result in diel oxygen swings that impact fisheries and aquatic life (Welch, 1992), and increase the levels of organochlorine compounds (PCBs) in localized trout populations (Berglund, 2003). Eutrophication has been recognized as a water quality problem for a long time, well illustrated by the fact that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) commenced a national eutrophication survey of streams (Omernik, 1977) shortly after the passage of the 1972 Clean Water Act. To address the national eutrophication problem, the U.S. EPA in 1998 announced that it expected all States and Tribes to adopt numeric nutrient standards by 2003. However, recognizing the complexity of developing and implementing such standards, the

[1]Paper No. J05187 of the *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* (JAWRA). Received November 17, 2005; accepted June 6, 2006.

[2]Respectively, Environmental Science Specialist, Montana Department of Environmental Quality, 1520 E. 6th Avenue, Helena, Montana 59620; Senior Associate, ICF International, 33 Hayden Avenue, 3rd Floor, Lexington, Massachusetts 02421; Project Manager, ICF International, 97 Orchard Woods Drive, Saunderstown, Rhode Island 02874 (E-mail/Suplee: msuplee@mt.gov).

0005145

U.S. EPA subsequently provided a more flexible approach. This approach allows States and Tribes to submit to the U.S. EPA plans outlining the process and schedule of how they intend to adopt numeric nutrient standards (memorandum to States and Tribes from U.S. EPA, Office of Science and Technology; November 14, 2001). The Montana Department of Environmental Quality (MT DEQ) developed and submitted such a plan in 2002.

It has been widely recognized that numeric nutrient standards would not be the same everywhere, due to natural influences on nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) concentrations by landscape-level characteristics such as climate, geology, soils, vegetation, watershed area, etc. (Johnson *et al.*, 1997; U.S. EPA, 1998; Rohm *et al.*, 2002; Snelder and Biggs, 2002; Snelder *et al.*, 2004). Ecoregions integrate into a single mapping system a number of these nutrient-influencing geographic factors (Omernik, 1987). Ecoregions have been used to partition the United States into zones expected to manifest relatively uniform nutrient concentrations (U.S. EPA, 1998, 2000a; Rohm *et al.*, 2002). This partitioning process is a necessary first step towards establishing numeric nutrient standards. However, there remains the need to identify appropriate nutrient criteria for each ecoregional zone.

Two statistically based approaches have been recommended by the U.S. EPA to select a criterion for any particular nutrient (e.g., total N, total P), within any particular ecoregion (U.S. EPA, 2000*b*). The first approach identifies the criterion as the 75th percentile of the frequency distribution of nutrient data from reference stream sites within an ecoregion. Reference stream sites are relatively undisturbed examples (i.e., they have minimal human impacts and support all beneficial water uses) that can represent the natural biological, physical, and chemical integrity of a region (Hughes *et al.*, 1986; Barbour *et al.*, 1996; Kershner *et al.*, 2004). The second approach selects as the criterion the 5th to 25th percentile of the frequency distribution from the general-population of nutrient data (U.S. EPA, 2000b). In practice, however, the 25th percentile is more frequently discussed in the U.S. EPA's nutrient documents than the 5th percentile, and is the basis for the U.S. EPA's national nutrient criteria recommendations (see U.S. EPA, 2000a, 2001; and related Clean Water Act section 304(a) nutrient-criteria documents). The option to select as criterion either the 75th percentile of reference or the 25th percentile of the general population is presumptive, as it assumes that reference and general-population frequency distributions will have a particular relationship to one another (Figure 1), and so nutrient concentrations selected via either approach will be similar.

In accordance with its nutrient criteria plan, the MT DEQ has been examining in detail the two criteria-selection approaches outlined above. MT DEQ identified a number of stream reference sites in the early 1990s (Bahls *et al.*, 1992), and has had a project in place since 2000 to identify and sample reference stream sites around the state (Suplee *et al.*, 2005). The availability of reference stream nutrient data enabled us to examine the relative merits of the reference *vs.* the general-population approach to developing nutrient criteria. Our purpose in writing this paper was to describe our finding that nutrient concentrations at the 25th percentile of general-population frequency distributions may represent overly stringent — or insufficiently protective — criteria. This will be dependent upon the relationship between the nutrient distribution of the general population and that of the corresponding reference population. We also report that nutrient concentrations at the 86th percentile of reference-site frequency distributions appear to be reasonable for establishing criteria. This is because nutrient concentrations at the 86th percentile of reference generally matched nutrient concentrations that begin to cause impacts to beneficial water uses (e.g., recreation and aesthetics, aquatic life) that are published in regional scientific studies.



FIGURE 1. Presumptive Relationship Between a Reference and a General Population of Nutrient Data, Redrawn From U.S. EPA (2000b). The range of nutrient concentrations along the *x*-axis falling within the gray-shaded box are recommended by the U.S. EPA as appropriate nutrient criteria.

METHODS

Data Sources for the Development of a River and Stream Nutrient Database

The primary data source for the analyses was from the U.S. EPA's Storage and Retrieval (STORET)

0005146

database. In March 2001, a request was placed with the then-functioning mainframe STORET database for all ambient surface water-quality data from Montana, excluding data from pipes, wells and springs. The delimited text file received was then transferred to a Microsoft Access® relational database. The STORET data (also referred to as Legacy STORET) contained data collected by 33 agencies or entities (organizations), and held nutrient data from the early 1960s to 1998. A query was run in the "Type" field (a field indicating the waterbody type) to remove lake data. The database was supplemented with all river and stream nutrient data from MT DEQ found in modernized STORET, which were collected from 2000 to 2004. Also added to the relational database were Montana river and stream data collected by the University of Montana, Utah State University, the U.S. EPA's Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP; Lazorchak *et al.*, 1998), and reference-stream nutrient data up through 2005 (reference streams will be discussed further on in Methods.) The database contained 5,300 sampling sites and over 140,000 total records. Readers should note that the data sources we used are comparable to those used by the U.S. EPA in developing its nutrient criteria recommendations. The U.S. EPA used data sources that included Legacy STORET, two United States Geological Survey projects (the National Stream Quality Accounting Network and the National Water-Quality Assessment [NAWQA] Program), and regional U.S. EPA data (see U.S. EPA, 2000a and related documents). Our database contained more records per level III ecoregion than the database the U.S. EPA used to develop its criteria recommendations, because the U.S. EPA restricted its dataset to information collected from 1990 to 1998 (U.S. EPA, 2000a).

Each analytical measurement in Legacy STORET was uniquely identified by a parameter code (e.g., 00665; total P). Other data that were incorporated into the relational database, including those from modernized STORET, did not use these codes. To assure consistency and to facilitate the grouping of data (discussed below), the appropriate parameter code was assigned to each observation lacking a code. The water quality data in the assembled database, which included latitude and longitude coordinates for each observation, were then spatially joined to Geographic Information System (GIS) layers containing information on level III and level IV ecoregions (Figure 2; Woods *et al.*, 2002). Observations were also labeled with the stream order (Strahler, 1964) of the stream reach from which they were collected. Strahler stream orders were derived from the U.S. EPA's reach file 3 (RF3) GIS layer (1:100,000 scale; U.S. EPA, 1994).

The final database was transferred to Stata® (version 7), which was more amenable to statistical analysis programming, and was referred to as the "all-observations" database to distinguish it from a "median" database. The median database was developed from the all-observations database and contained only the medians of the observed values for each nutrient, for each station, and for each season. (Seasonal data stratification will be detailed in a following Methods subsection.) The median database was developed because it was less likely than the all-observations database to be influenced by outliers, and was therefore more amenable to parametric statistical analyses.

Data Quality Control Methodology

Examination of the Legacy STORET dataset confirmed that it did not contain water quality data from pipes, wells or springs. Pipe, well, and spring sampling stations had been included in a Legacy STORET metadata (station-information) file. We linked this metadata file to the water quality database and verified that none of the pipe, well or spring sampling stations could be joined with any water quality data. To eliminate potentially erroneous or highly uncertain data from the analyses, data bearing certain comments codes were excluded (Table 1). Also, observations in the database bearing comment codes indicating the analytical result was below detection were replaced with values equal to 50% of the reported detection limits (DL/2; Table 1). For datasets skewed to the right, which were common in our nutrient database, the DL/2 method is reported to be sufficiently accurate for determining descriptive statistics like the mean and standard deviation (Hornung and Reed, 1990). Further, if less than 15% of the total dataset is below detection, the U.S. EPA (2006) indicated that the nondetect observations may be substituted, preferably with DL/2 values. Less than 15% of total observations in our database were below detection. Finally, nutrient observations with reported values of zero were excluded from use, since they probably represented data entry errors. Most analytical results in the database provided a result value, a detection limit and an indication when the measurement was below detection. True analytical result values of zero are very unlikely; for example, zeros are not reported for low-level organic pesticide analyses using HPLC methods even when no peak is detected (technical memorandum 94-12 from National Water Quality Laboratory to NAWQA study-unit chiefs, July 8, 1994, http://nwql.usgs.gov/Public/tech_memos/nwql.94-12.html).

Water quality data collected from streams and rivers are rarely normally distributed and are

0005147



FIGURE 2. Map of Montana Showing the Location of General and Reference Population Sampling Stations. Shaded areas on the map are Omernik Level-III ecoregions.

frequently skewed to the right (i.e., lognormally distributed), and the presence of high outlier values in such datasets is common (Helsel and Hirsch, 1992). We did not have knowledge of the flow conditions or other important factors prevalent at the time the data were collected, and it would have been inappropriate to eliminate outlier data simply because they inconvenienced the statistical analyses (Helsel and Hirsch, 1992). Therefore, beyond the quality control measures described above, we did not further eliminate any data from the database.

Nutrient Data Grouping Methodology

We identified thirty different nutrient analytical measurements of N and P in the database, each bearing its own parameter code. Many appeared to be closely related, and rather than select a single parameter code to represent a given nutrient type (e.g., total P, 00665), we opted to aggregate the analytical measurements into groups. This approach allowed us to retain many nutrient analytical measurements that would have otherwise not been used. The objective was to group nutrient analytical measurements together that were fundamentally equivalent, while at the same time avoiding double-counts in cases where an agency may have reported two or more grouped analytical measurements from the same sample. The approach was undertaken in a series of steps. First, the different analytical measurements were identified by their parameter codes and other identifying information, checked against records (U.S. EPA, 1979; Alexander *et al.*, 1996; Clesceri *et al.*, 1998) to determine what they measured, and then organized into groups. The thirty nutrient measurements in the database were thus aggregated into seven groups (Table 2). Although we developed this grouping methodology independently, it is nearly identical to that used by Mueller *et al.* (1995) to aggregate nutrient data for an analysis of surface and groundwater. Next, a series of exploratory queries were made in the database for each group and for each agency, to ascertain if any analytical measurements within the group were derived from the same sample. In cases where this occurred, only

TABLE 1. Quality Control Actions Taken to Eliminate Potentially Erroneous or Highly Uncertain Data.

Data Remark Code	Remark Code Description	Database Source	QC Action Taken
*	No definition could be found	Various	Eliminated*
<	Less than detection	Various	Kept; used 50% of reported detection limit
E	Estimated value	NWIS	Eliminated
H	Field-kit determination	STORET	Eliminated
J	Estimated value	STORET	Eliminated
K	Value known to be less than reported value	STORET	Kept; used 50% of reported detection limit
L	Value know to be greater than reported value	STORET	Eliminated
M	Presence varified, but at a level too low to quantify	STORET	Kept; used 50% of reported detection limit
ND	Non-detect	Various	Kept; used 50% of reported detection limit
Non-detect	Non-detect	Various	Kept; used 50% of reported detection limit
O	Sampled for, but analysis lost	STORET	Eliminated
Q	Sample held beyond normal holding time	STORET	Eliminated
T	Value reported is less than criteria of detection	STORET	Kept; used 50% of reported detection limit
U	Material was analyzed for, but not detected	STORET	Kept; used 50% of reported detection limit
W	Value observed is less than lowest value reportable under "T"	STORET	Kept; used 50% of reported detection limit
Y	Sample analyzed, but was not properly preserved; may not be accurate	STORET	Eliminated

*Only three observations were found that bore this data remark code.

one of the analytical measurements was retained for that agency (generally the largest sample contributor). Stata® programs were developed to create the nutrient groups, convert all reporting units to “as N” or “as P”, and to prevent sample double counts.

Entire analytical measurements were eliminated (those in gray-shaded areas; Table 2) if a clear definition for the measurement could not be located. And although placed in the nitrate & nitrite group, nitrite-only measurements were completely excluded from use. In most ambient waters exposed to oxygen, nitrite is only present in trace quantities and most dissolved inorganic N is nitrate (Horne and Goldman, 1994). A review of the database showed that most nitrite measurements were very low or below the reported detection limit. Therefore, by aggregating analytical measurements that jointly report nitrite + nitrate (e.g., parameter code 00630; Table 2) with measurements that only report nitrate (e.g., 00618), we assumed that the nitrite + nitrate samples were mostly nitrate.

Development of Seasonal Periods to Partition Nutrient Data

Nutrient concentrations in flowing waters can show distinct seasonal patterns (Lohman and Priscu, 1992; Horne and Goldman, 1994). Our objective here was to define seasonal (time) periods for each level III ecoregion, which we assumed would reduce intra-ecoregional variability in nutrient concentrations. Hydrological, biological and climatic data were all used to derive starting and ending dates of each season. Data from United State Geological Survey (USGS) gauge stations were used to address the hydrologic aspect. Two conditions were established to select the USGS gauge stations used to define flow patterns. First, each gauge station had to have at least 5 years of continuous flow records, although the stations did not need to be sampled up to the present (e.g., a continuous record from 1942 to 1963 was acceptable). Second, gauge stations were selected from stream segments having no major hydrologic modifications such as dams. Every effort was made to ensure that the selected stations provided good spatial coverage of each ecoregion, while at the same time meeting the conditions listed above. All together, 63 USGS gauge stations were selected (Appendix A), with from 10 to 12 stations per ecoregion. Two ecoregions (Idaho Batholith and Wyoming Basin; Woods *et al.*, 2002) have very limited geographic extents in Montana, however, and only six and three suitable gauge stations, respectively, could be located.

Flow duration hydrographs based on daily-mean flows were developed for each station in order to derive onset and termination dates for the runoff period. These hydrographs were developed using the complete period of record of gauge-station flow data extracted from the USGS’s National Water Information System (NWIS) database. For each hydrograph, the average of all daily flow records was calculated separately for each day of the year. Each of the long-term average daily flows calculated in this manner was then plotted, and the hydrograph curve thus generated represented the average annual flow pattern at the station for the period of record (Figure 3). The two points of greatest inflection on the hydrographs were used to define the runoff onset and termination dates (e.g., day 101 and 205; Figure 3).

0005149

TABLE 2. Nutrient Groups Developed for This Study.

STORET Parameter Code	STORET Descriptor 1	STORET Descriptor 2	STORET Descriptor 3	Nutrient Reporting Units	Functional Groups
00610	NH_3 + NH4	N-TOTAL	MG/L	N	Ammonia Group
71845	AMMONIA	TOT-NH_4	MG/L	NH_4	
00608	NH_3 + NH_4	N-DISS	MG/L	N	
71846	AMMONIA	DISS-NH_4	MG/L	NH_4	
00625	TOT KJEL	N	MG/L	N	Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen Group
00605	ORG-N	N	MG/L	N	
00607	ORG-N	DISS-N	MG/L	N	
00623	KJELDL N	DISS	MG/L	N	
00624	KJELDL N	SUSP	MG/L	N	
00600	TOTAL N	N	MG/L	N	Total N Group
00602	DISS.	NITROGEN	MG/L N	N	
71887	TOTAL N	AS NO_3	MG/L	NO_3	
00630	NO_2 + NO_3	N-TOTAL	MG/L	N	Nitrate & Nitrite Group
00631	NO_2 + NO_3	N-DISS	MG/L	N	
00618	NO_3-N	DISS	MG/L	N	
00620	NO_3-N	TOTAL	MG/L	N	
71850	NITRATE	TOT-NO_3	MG/L	NO_3	
71851	NITRATE	DISS-NO_3	MG/L	NO_3	
00613	NO_2-N	DISS	MG/L	N	
71856	NITRITE	DISS-NO_2	MG/L	NO_2	
00615	NO_2-N	TOTAL	MG/L	N	
00665	PHOS TOT		MG/L P	P	Total P Group
71886	TOTAL P	AS PO_4	MG/L	PO_4	
00669	PHOS TOT	HYDRO	MG/L P	P	
00678	PHOS TOT	HYDRO + ORTH	MG/L P	P	
00671	PHOS-DIS	ORTHO	MG/L P	P	Soluble Reactive Phosphate Group
70507	PHOS-T	ORTHO	MG/L P	P	
00660	ORTHOPO_4	PO_4	MG/L	PO_4	
00650	T PO_4	PO_4	MG/L	PO_4	
00666	PHOS-DIS		MG/L P	P	Total Dissolved P Group

Nutrient analytical measurements shown in gray were not used. All values were converted to elemental reporting units (i.e., as N, as P) prior to data analyses.
Total number of samples found in MT: Ammonia Group, 18,647; TKN Group, 19,462; TN Group, 6226; Nitrate Group, 29,798; TOTAL P Group, 24,453; SRP Group, 15,361; TDP Group, 6071.

After the hydrologically based dates for the onset and termination of runoff were compiled, it became obvious that the runoff termination dates suggested by some of the flow-duration hydrographs located in the mountainous ecoregions (Northern, Middle, and Canadian Rockies) extended longer into the summer than the MT DEQ has generally found there to be discernable scouring effects on aquatic life. Therefore, we turned to biological data to further define the seasons. The MT DEQ uses June 21st as the start date for biological sampling in streams of mountainous regions of the state (MT DEQ, Standard Operating Procedures for Sample Collection, Sorting, and Taxonomic Identification of Benthic Macroinvertebrates, Water Quality Planning Bureau, WQPBWQM-009, April 2005), as runoff effects have typically subsided by that time. A number of hydrographs in the mountainous ecoregions showed that runoff was still occurring on June 21st. Therefore, for ecoregions in which this occurred, we selected the runoff termination date as the earliest day after June 21st on which all flow-duration hydrographs in the ecoregion were at least on the declining limb of the peak flow.

The selection of the start-of-winter dates could not be readily determined using hydrograph characteristics. After runoff ends, base flow begins and can be fairly uniform into November and December (day 235-365; Figure 3). However, regional climatic influences such as lowered temperatures and light intensity typically cause by the end of September major reductions in aquatic plant life growth, as well as reductions in aquatic macroinvertebrate productivity (Richards, 1996). In general, the MT DEQ uses September 21st as the termination date for biological sampling (Standard Operation Procedures, cited



FIGURE 3. Example Daily-Means Flow Duration Hydrograph. Data are for the entire period of record (1982-2003) for USGS Gauge Station 12381400.

above), and only rarely collects biological samples after October 1st. After having examined the hydrological, biological and climatic factors discussed, the onset and termination dates of the seasons were finalized for each ecoregion. The onset and termination dates were then rounded to the nearest end-of-month or mid-month date (Table 3).

Nutrient data in the databases were associated with the appropriate season by their dates of collection. Significant differences (95% confidence) between seasons were tested using the Kruskal-Wallis test (Conover, 1999). Kruskal-Wallis tests were performed on the nutrient general population separately for each level III ecoregion; that is, the data were first stratified by ecoregion before the significance of seasonal groups was tested. (The tests for the reference population had very low power because of the reference population's small size, and the results are not presented here.) Kruskal-Wallis tests were performed for the general population in the all-observations database and the median database.

Selection of Reference Sites

The identification and assessment of Montana reference stream sites is discussed in detail in Suplee *et al.* (2005), and will be only briefly summarized here. A group of candidate reference stream sites was assembled and then assessed using a consistent set of criteria that included both quantitative and qualitative evaluations. Data were examined at two scales: site specific, and watershed (5th or 4th hydrologic unit codes; Seaber *et al.*, 1987). The qualitative component was undertaken by using best professional judgment (BPJ) to assess criteria such as "presence of point sources," "grazing use," "aesthetics," "condition of stream bank vegetation," and "mining

TABLE 3. Starting and Ending Dates for Three Seasons (Winter, Runoff, and Growing), by Level III Ecoregion.

Ecoregion Name	Start of Winter	End of Winter	Start of Runoff	End of Runoff	Start of Growing Season	End of Growing Season
Canadian Rockies	October 1	April 14	April 15	June 30	July 1	September 30
Northern Rockies	October 1	March 31	April 1	June 30	July 1	September 30
Idaho Batholith	October 1	April 14	April 15	July 15	July 16	September 30
Middle Rockies	October 1	April 14	April 15	July 15	July 16	September 30
Northwestern Glaciated Plains	October 1	March 14	March 15	June 15	June 16	September 30
Northwestern Great Plains	October 1	February 29	March 1	June 30	July 1	September 30
Wyoming Basin	October 1	April 14	April 15	June 30	July 1	September 30

0005151

impacts." Quantitative analyses consisted of watershed-level assessments and a site-specific analysis. At the watershed level, the proportion of agricultural land use and the total density of roads (km/km^2) was determined for the watershed upstream of each candidate reference site using a GIS. Criteria were then located in the literature (Kershner *et al.*, 2004; Sheeder and Evans, 2004) to estimate thresholds for impacts to aquatic life and other beneficial water uses. At the site-specific level, water quality data for each site were reviewed to determine if they exceeded state water quality standards (MT DEQ (Montana Department of Environmental Quality), 2006) for a suite of metals contaminants commonly released from mining areas (Cd, Cu, Pb, Zn, Hg, and dissolved Al).

Some candidate reference sites were in a reference condition for certain characteristics (e.g., riparian condition), but failed in another category, for example having high density of abandoned mines in the watershed or metals concentrations that exceeded the state standards. Sites of this nature were not retained as reference sites. That is, none of the reference sites that passed to the final list contained any "fatal" flaws, and only sites passing all criteria were included. The final reference site list contained streams ranging in stream-order size (Strahler, 1964) from 1st to 6th, which generally comprised wadeable streams and small rivers. All data associated with reference sites were flagged in the Stata® database to distinguish them from nonreference population data. The locations of reference sites are shown in Figure 2.

Percentile Mapping: Reference-to-General Population

Percentile mapping is the identification of corresponding percentile values of equivalent nutrient concentrations in two different data distributions. Percentile mapping for the reference-to-general population was carried out in two major steps. In the first step, summary statistics were computed for nutrient groups in the reference, nonreference, and general (reference plus nonreference) populations by each alternative stratification methodology (i.e., combinations of ecoregions and seasons). Specific summary statistics included the total number of observations, minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviation, and skewness. The summary statistics also included concentrations at the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles for reference, nonreference and general population observations. Percentile mapping was only undertaken when four or more nutrient observations were available at nonreference and reference locations.

In the second step, the reference and general population frequency distributions were matched within each stratification combination. Stata® programs were developed to compute the nutrient concentrations corresponding to the 75th and 90th percentiles of the reference population. Next, an empirical cumulative distribution function was generated to assign a percentile rank to each nutrient concentration observation in the general population. The percentiles in the general population corresponding to the nutrient concentrations at the 75th and 90th percentiles in the reference distribution were then determined using a linear interpolation method. A cubic interpolation method was also tested. However, in most cases, the cubic interpolation method did not differ from the linear method and it resulted in missing values in a few boundary cases. Therefore, the linear interpolation method was exclusively applied for this analysis.

Percentile Mapping: Case Studies-to-Reference Population

Four conditions were used to select stressor-response case studies that were used to make comparisons against the reference-population frequency distributions. These were: (1) the case study reported a scientifically defensible linkage between nutrient concentrations and an impact to a beneficial water use (e.g., recreation & aesthetics, aquatic life, fisheries); (2) each case study's geographic extent was within a level III ecoregion found in Montana; (3) the stream or river in the case study generally fell within the scope of the present work (i.e., similar Strahler stream order); and (4) the case study was documented in some kind of publication. The nutrient concentrations recommended in or derived from these case studies were then mapped to their corresponding concentrations in the reference-population frequency distributions from the same ecoregion and season. In cases where more than one percentile in the reference distribution had the same concentrations (e.g., both the 50th and 75th percentile were equal to 0.05 mg total P/L), the higher percentile was selected.

Five scientific case studies that met the conditions for use were located for four different level III ecoregions. Welch *et al.* (1989) modeled the influence of SRP concentrations on periphyton biomass in the Spokane River of Idaho and Washington. The Spokane River is a sixth-order river in the Northern Rockies ecoregion, which extends into Montana. Watson *et al.* (1990) used artificial stream channels utilizing water from the Clark Fork River in Montana (4th-7th-order) and control nutrient inputs (N and P) to determine the peak biomass of diatom algae and the filamentous algae *Cladophora*. Dodds *et al.* (1997) used a river and stream database comprised of sites from North America, Europe, and New Zealand to develop regression equations between nutrients and algal standing crop, and then recommend criteria for Montana's reach of the Clark Fork River. Based on a 16-year study, Sosiak (2002) recommended P concentrations intended to maintain algae density below nuisance levels in the Bow River (5th order; Alberta, Canada). Lastly, Suplee (2004) presented a regression equation between standing crop of algae and nitrate concentrations in Montana prairie streams (3-4th order), and recommended maximum concentrations for total N, total P and algal standing crop.

Other Descriptive Statistics and Statistical Analyses

As described earlier, we generated summary statistics for nutrient concentrations in the all-observations database for each alternative stratification methodology (i.e., combinations of ecoregions and seasons). This was also carried out for the median database. In addition, we were concerned that nutrient data from large rivers (Strahler order 7 and 8), for example the Missouri and Yellowstone rivers, might bias comparisons between the general and reference-population frequency distributions. (Recall that the reference sites came from first through sixth-order streams and small rivers). Therefore, we also generated summary statistics from an all-observations dataset that excluded data from seventh and eighth-order rivers. Statistically significant differences (95% confidence level) between nutrient concentrations of the reference and general populations were determined using the Wilcoxson ranksum test (Conover, 1999).

RESULTS

Seasonal Differences in Nutrient Concentrations

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis tests for ecoregionally stratified seasonal differences in nutrient concentrations are presented in Tables 4a and b. For nutrient zones based on level III ecoregions, there were significant seasonal differences in median nutrient concentrations in the general population. This was true for the majority of cases in the all-observation database, and for many cases in the median database. In the all-observations database, the majority of the nutrient groups showed significant seasonal differences for each level III ecoregions, except for the Wyoming Basin (Table 4a). The Wyoming Basin has a very limited geographic extent in Montana, which resulted in low power of the tests. For other nutrient groupings for which the trends are not significant, mainly in the median database, the results may reflect the low power of the tests because of the relatively small sample sizes associated with those nutrients.

Percentile Mapping, Descriptive Statistics and Statistical Test Results

Based on the all-observations database, Tables 5a through 5d present the 75th and 90th reference percentile equivalents in the general population for all seven nutrient groups in each level III ecoregion,

TABLE 4. Significance of Seasonal Stratification by Level III Ecoregions

Level III Ecoregion	Nutrient Group*: Ammonia	$NO_3 + NO_2$	TKN	Total N	SRP	TDP	Total P	Proportion of Nutrient Groups Showing Significant Differences in Seasons (%)
(**a**) All-observations database, general population								
Northern Rockies	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	86
Idaho Batholith	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	71
Middle Rockies	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	86
Wyoming Basin	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	43
Canadian Rockies	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	71
Northwestern Glaciated Plains	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100
Northwestern Great Plains	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	86
(**b**) Median database, general population								
Northern Rockies	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	43
Idaho Batholith	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	29
Middle Rockies	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	71
Wyoming Basin	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	14
Canadian Rockies	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	14
Northwestern Glaciated Plains	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	57
Northwestern Great Plains	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	86

*"Y" means the median concentrations are different between seasons (Kruskel-Wallis test, 95% confidence interval).
"N" means the median concentrations are not significantly different between seasons.

0005153

TABLE 5. Cross-Nutrient Percentile Mapping for Level III Ecoregions.

	Level III Ecoregion* and Reference Percentiles									
	Northern Rockies		Middle Rockies		Canadian Rockies		Northwestern Glaciated Plains		Northwestern Great Plains	
Nutrient Group	**75th**	**90th**	**75th**	**90th**	**75th**	**90th**	**75th**	**90th**	**75th**	**90th**
(**a**) All seasons										
Ammonia	–	–	18	49	13	13	81	91	44	67
$NO_3 + NO_2$	32	47	38	59	19	26	49	74	74	82
SRP	15	16	23	23	46	54	64	80	73	81
TKN	27	49	44	60	52	66	84	91	77	93
Total N	–	–	66	79	62	77	66	85	74	95
Total P	4	4	29	54	27	31	83	92	86	96
TDP	–	–	38	56	–	–	84	95	96	98
Mean:	19	29	36	54	36	44	73	87	75	87
1 SD of mean:	13	23	16	17	20	25	14	8	16	11
CV (%):	65	78	44	31	54	56	19	9	21	13
(**b**) Winter season										
Ammonia	–	–	17	45	–	–	83	85	47	61
$NO_3 + NO_2$	–	–	28	38	9	15	75	79	72	77
SRP	–	–	9	25	15	18	52	78	81	89
TKN	–	–	39	54	–	–	81	88	86	94
Total N	–	–	–	–	–	–	88	97	81	91
Total P	–	–	16	45	6	7	76	85	90	94
TDP	–	–	–	–	–	–	74	88	97	98
Mean:	–	–	21	41	10	14	75	86	79	86
1 SD of mean:	–	–	12	11	5	6	12	6	16	13
CV (%):	–	–	54	26	49	43	15	7	20	15
(**c**) Runoff season										
Ammonia	–	–	19	51	–	–	87	92	16	45
$NO_3 + NO_2$	30	47	39	64	27	35	65	76	54	77
SRP	19	21	19	39	59	70	76	88	71	80
TKN	–	–	47	62	–	–	75	90	89	97
Total N	–	–	–	–	–	–	57	73	91	97
Total P	6	6	33	55	35	42	80	90	91	98
TDP	–	–	40	40	–	–	90	97	89	96
Mean:	18	25	33	52	40	49	76	87	72	84
1 SD of mean:	12	21	12	11	17	19	12	9	28	20
CV (%):	66	84	35	20	41	38	15	10	40	23
(**d**) Growing season										
Ammonia	–	–	34	51	23	23	77	85	57	79
$NO_3 + NO_2$	28	28	33	58	19	27	34	56	80	89
SRP	11	12	27	27	44	51	43	82	74	82
TKN	24	44	41	71	60	70	86	91	69	94
Total N	–	–	68	80	85	91	61	89	81	96
Total P	5	15	19	38	27	30	81	91	87	96
TDP	–	–	–	–	–	–	80	95	96	98
Mean:	17	25	37	54	43	49	66	84	78	90
1 SD of mean:	11	15	17	20	26	27	20	13	13	7
CV (%):	65	60	45	37	60	56	31	16	16	8

For each ecoregion and nutrient, value shown is the percentile in the general data population matching the 75th or 90th percentile of the reference population, respectively.

*Results for the Wyoming Basin and the Idaho Batholyth ecoregions not shown, as there were too few reference observations ($n < 4$) to undertake the matching process. Dashes in the table indicate too few observations ($n < 4$) to undertake analysis.

for all seasons combined (Table 5a) and for each season (Tables 5b through 5d). Reference-to-general population matches for specific nutrients were highly variable between ecoregions, as nutrient concentrations at the 75th percentile of reference corresponded to general-population percentiles ranging from the 4th percentile to the 97th percentile. In general, the mountainous ecoregions (Northern, Middle and Canadian Rockies) showed greater separation between reference and general-population data than did the two prairie ecoregions (Northwestern Glaciated and Great plains). That is, general population streams in mountainous ecoregions had elevated nutrient concentrations relative to their corresponding reference streams whereas, in the prairie ecoregions, nutrients in reference and general-population streams were much more similar. Furthermore, the cross-nutrient standard deviations (and coefficient of variation, CV) around the mean of the mapped percentiles were fairly low in the two prairie ecoregions (see bottoms of Tables 5a to 5d). It is also apparent from Tables 5a through 5d that seasonal trends were not very pronounced in the percentile mappings. The only exceptions to this finding were for the Middle Rockies and the Canadian Rockies, where general-population percentiles corresponding to the 75th and 90th percentiles in the reference population were lower in the winter season than for other seasons. In another analysis not presented here, cross-ecoregional percentile mapping (e.g., grouping all total P percentile matches together across ecoregions) showed that, for a given nutrient, the cross-nutrient standard deviation around the mean in a given ecoregion was generally lower than the cross-ecoregional standard deviation around the mean.

There were only a limited number of cases (11%) for which the 75th percentile of the reference population mapped closely (±5 percentiles) to the 25th percentile of the general population (Tables 5a through 5d). Similarly, of 19 aggregate cross-nutrient results (see "Mean" rows, Tables 5a through 5d) there was only one case (Middle Rockies, winter season) where the 75th percentile of reference population closely mapped (±5 percentiles) to the 25th percentile of the general population.

Tables 6a through 6c show nutrient concentrations (all seasons) at the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles of the reference and nonreference populations, for each ecoregion. Table 6a was generated from the all-observations database, Table 6b from the same but excluding stream order 7 & 8 data, and Table 6c was generated from the median database. Overall, all three databases produce very comparable results. One anomaly in the datasets is the fact that TKN concentrations are often higher than TN in equivalent ecoregions and seasons. This resulted because TN data have generally been collected more recently, and have relatively low detection limits, whereas TKN was part of many older datasets, and TKN detection limits where commonly higher in the past. Table 7 shows the results of significance comparisons between reference and nonreference populations (all seasons), by ecoregion, for the all-observations and median databases. (Significance tests were performed for the all-observations database excluding stream order 7 & 8 data, but the results were virtually identical to the all-observations database and are not shown.) Although there was 100% agreement in significance-test results between the all-observations and median databases for the Canadian Rockies, in the remaining ecoregions there was disagreement between database results in about 35% of cases. For the great majority of nutrients in the mountainous ecoregions (Northern, Middle, and Canadian Rockies), there were significant differences between the reference and nonreference nutrient concentrations (Table 7). However, in the two prairie ecoregions (Northwestern Glaciated and Great plains), nutrient concentrations in the reference and nonreference populations were significantly different in only half of the cases or less.

The results of the case studies-to-reference population mapping are shown in Table 8. As for the reference-to-general population mapping, these results are based on the all-observations database. Case studies were located for four of Montana's seven level III ecoregions (Northern Rockies, Middle Rockies, Canadian Rockies, and the Northwestern Glaciated Plains). Overall, nutrient concentrations from case studies mapped to nutrient concentrations in reference-population distributions across a much smaller range than was observed for the reference-to-general population mappings. The case studies-to-reference population mappings ranged from the 68th to the 99th percentiles (Table 8). Overall, nutrient concentrations from the case studies mapped to the 86th (mean) and 86th (median) percentile of the reference populations, with a CV of 13% (Table 8, bottom row).

DISCUSSION

The databases used in the present study comprised data from longitudinal samplings of the same streams, most data were not sampled probabilistically and therefore a number of samples are not truly independent. Our goal, however, was to create a nutrient database having the greatest possible spatial and temporal coverage of the state. To achieve this, we assembled data from as many organizations as possible, over the greatest possible period of time, knowing that each organization had its own sampling goals, objectives and timeframes. We assumed that compiling data from many organizations would minimize bias associated with any one organization's dataset. Even probabilistically collected datasets may contain some type of bias. For example, the one truly probabilistic dataset we incorporated (EMAP; 2000-2004) was entirely collected during a statewide dry cycle when moderate to extreme drought was common (hydrological drought index; Palmer, 1965; NCDC (National Climate Data Center), 2006). In contrast, our database contained data collected during

TABLE 6. Nutrient Concentrations (mg/L) in Reference and Non-reference Populations (All Seasons) for Selected Percentiles of the Frequency Distributions. Data Are Organized by Level III Ecoregion*

	Northern Rockies						Middle Rockies						Canadian Rockies						Northwestern Glaciated Plains						Northwestern Great Plains					
	Reference			Non-Reference			Reference			Non-Reference			Reference			Non-Reference			Reference			Non-Reference			Reference			Non-Reference		
Nutrient Group	25th	50th	75th	25th	50th	75th	25th	50th	75th	25th	50th	75th	25th	50th	75th	25th	50th	75th	25th	50th	75th	25th	50th	75th	25th	50th	75th	25th	50th	75th
(**a**) All-observations database																														
Ammonia	–	–	–	0.005	0.010	0.020	0.002	0.002	0.005	0.005	0.020	0.050	0.004	0.005	0.005	0.010	0.010	0.030	0.020	0.050	0.120	0.010	0.035	0.090	0.005	0.010	0.030	0.010	0.040	0.100
$NO_3 + NO_2$	0.008	0.010	0.020	0.020	0.050	0.100	0.005	0.020	0.040	0.020	0.080	0.230	0.004	0.007	0.010	0.040	0.050	0.100	0.001	0.005	0.050	0.020	0.050	0.200	0.020	0.090	0.250	0.030	0.070	0.260
SRP	0.006	0.007	0.007	0.010	0.010	0.020	0.002	0.005	0.010	0.010	0.020	0.060	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.005	0.010	0.010	0.005	0.007	0.020	0.005	0.010	0.030	0.010	0.020	0.030	0.010	0.010	0.030
TKN	0.050	0.050	0.100	0.100	0.200	0.400	0.050	0.200	0.210	0.130	0.300	0.500	0.050	0.050	0.200	0.080	0.200	0.600	0.700	1.000	1.500	0.480	0.800	1.200	0.270	0.575	1.100	0.400	0.680	1.100
Total N	–	–	–	0.130	0.220	0.370	0.065	0.085	0.175	0.050	0.090	0.280	0.050	0.060	0.090	0.060	0.080	0.240	0.615	0.760	1.120	0.600	0.900	1.400	0.520	0.780	1.300	0.610	0.890	1.300
Total P	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.010	0.020	0.040	0.008	0.010	0.020	0.020	0.040	0.080	0.001	0.002	0.003	0.010	0.010	0.020	0.040	0.060	0.140	0.020	0.050	0.100	0.030	0.060	0.170	0.020	0.040	0.090
TDP	–	–	–	0.010	0.020	0.030	0.010	0.020	0.020	0.010	0.030	0.040	–	–	–	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.010	0.030	0.050	0.010	0.020	0.030	0.030	0.050	0.140	0.010	0.020	0.030
(**b**) All-observations database excluding data collected from streams/rivers of strahler stream order 7 & 8																														
Ammonia	–	–	–	0.005	0.010	0.030	0.002	0.002	0.005	0.010	0.020	0.050	0.004	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.010	0.030	0.020	0.050	0.120	0.010	0.040	0.100	0.005	0.010	0.030	0.010	0.040	0.100
$NO_3 + NO_2$	0.008	0.010	0.020	0.020	0.050	0.110	0.005	0.020	0.040	0.020	0.070	0.200	0.004	0.007	0.010	0.030	0.050	0.100	0.001	0.005	0.050	0.020	0.050	0.200	0.020	0.090	0.250	0.020	0.050	0.240
SRP	0.006	0.007	0.007	0.010	0.010	0.030	0.002	0.005	0.010	0.010	0.030	0.060	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.005	0.005	0.010	0.005	0.007	0.020	0.005	0.010	0.030	0.010	0.020	0.030	0.010	0.010	0.030
TKN	0.050	0.050	0.100	0.100	0.200	0.500	0.050	0.200	0.210	0.050	0.200	0.450	0.050	0.050	0.200	0.060	0.120	0.400	0.700	1.000	1.500	0.500	0.810	1.300	0.270	0.575	1.100	0.430	0.700	1.700
Total N	–	–	–	0.170	0.270	0.410	0.065	0.085	0.175	0.050	0.090	0.200	0.050	0.060	0.090	0.060	0.080	0.240	0.615	0.760	1.120	0.640	0.930	1.400	0.520	0.780	1.300	0.630	0.910	1.300
Total P	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.010	0.010	0.050	0.008	0.010	0.020	0.010	0.030	0.070	0.001	0.002	0.003	0.010	0.010	0.020	0.040	0.060	0.140	0.020	0.050	0.100	0.030	0.060	0.170	0.020	0.040	0.080
TDP	–	–	–	0.010	0.010	0.030	0.010	0.020	0.000	0.020	0.030	0.050	–	–	–	0.005	0.010	0.015	0.010	0.030	0.050	0.010	0.020	0.030	0.030	0.050	0.090	0.010	0.020	0.030
(**c**) Median database																														
Ammonia	–	–	–	0.005	0.010	0.020	0.005	0.005	0.007	0.005	0.020	0.050	0.004	0.004	0.005	0.005	0.010	0.020	0.005	0.015	0.055	0.010	0.030	0.060	0.005	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.020	0.050
$NO_3 + NO_2$	0.007	0.050	0.115	0.015	0.045	0.130	0.010	0.021	0.055	0.020	0.050	0.130	0.007	0.010	0.040	0.035	0.050	0.105	0.003	0.005	0.020	0.010	0.050	0.185	0.005	0.040	0.100	0.020	0.057	0.200
SRP	–	–	–	0.010	0.010	0.020	0.003	0.009	0.014	0.010	0.020	0.050	0.002	0.003	0.005	0.005	0.010	0.010	0.003	0.009	0.016	0.010	0.030	0.070	0.004	0.010	0.030	0.010	0.020	0.035
TKN	0.050	0.050	0.100	0.100	0.200	0.500	0.100	0.200	0.215	0.095	0.240	0.450	0.050	0.100	0.200	0.050	0.110	0.300	0.565	1.000	1.660	0.335	0.700	1.132	0.345	0.530	1.565	0.280	0.522	1.000
Total N	–	–	–	0.100	0.150	0.250	0.070	0.090	0.260	0.065	0.115	0.270	0.050	0.070	0.090	0.060	0.080	0.090	0.590	0.720	0.940	0.680	0.975	1.300	0.290	0.620	1.250	0.500	0.810	1.200
Total P	0.001	0.003	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.030	0.006	0.010	0.022	0.010	0.030	0.060	0.001	0.002	0.004	0.009	0.010	0.020	0.015	0.055	0.110	0.020	0.050	0.100	0.030	0.040	0.150	0.020	0.040	0.090
TDP	–	–	–	0.010	0.020	0.030	–	–	–	0.020	0.040	0.090	–	–	–	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.025	0.175	0.020	0.020	0.050	–	–	–	0.010	0.020	0.030

*Results for the Wyoming Basin and the Idaho Batholyth ecoregions not shown; too few reference observations ($n < 4$). Dashes in the table indicate too few observations ($n < 4$) to generate distribution.

0005156

TABLE 7. Statistically Significant Differences Between Nutrient Concentrations of Reference and Non-reference Populations (All Seasons Combined) in Montana Level-III Ecoregions*.

Nutrient Group	Northern Rockies		Middle Rockies		Canadian Rockies		Northwestern Glaciated Plains		Northwestern Great Plains	
	All-observations Database†	Median Database†	All-observations Database†	Median Database†	All-observations Database†	Median Database†	All-observations Database†	Median Database†	All-observations Database†	Median Database†
Ammonia	–	–	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
$NO_3 + NO_2$	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
SRP	Y	–	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
TKN	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Total N	–	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Total P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
TDP	–	–	N	–	–	–	Y	N	Y	–

Results from the all-observations and median databases are shown. "Y" Indicates a significant difference in concentrations, " N" Indicates an insignificant difference (Wilcoxson-Ranksum Test, 95% confidence level).

*Results for the Wyoming Basin and the Idaho Batholyth ecoregions not shown; too few reference observations ($n < 4$).

†Dashes in the table indicate too few reference observations ($n < 4$) to generate distribution and conduct test.

numerous wet/dry climatic cycles, including several periods of extreme drought and extreme moisture (Palmer, 1965; NCDC (National Climate Data Center), 2006). Drought, and precipitation patterns in general, can influence water quality (Ojima *et al.*, 1999; Little *et al.*, 2003), and our database is capable of reflecting these influences because of its relatively long period of record.

In its guidance on the development of river and stream nutrient criteria, the U.S. EPA has recommended that for any given physiographic region the 75th percentile of a reference-site frequency distribution be selected or, alternatively, the 5th to 25th percentile of the general-population frequency distribution (U.S. EPA, 2000b). This recommendation assumes that either method "should approach a common reference condition along a continuum of data points" (page 95, U.S. EPA, 2000b). This presumption is based on three case studies — one in Tennessee, one in Minnesota, and one in New York — where it was found that the 75th percentiles of the reference site frequency distributions for nutrients closely matched to the 25th percentile of the general population frequency distributions (U.S. EPA, 2000a,b,c). However, two of these three case studies are from lakes (New York and Minnesota), waterbody types that are different from rivers and streams. Aside from the vast body of scientific literature on the topic of lotic and lentic waters, the fundamental difference between rivers/streams and lakes is illustrated by the fact that the U.S. EPA has developed its nutrient criteria recommendations separately for each of these two waterbody types (e.g., U.S. EPA, 2000a,d). Therefore, it is questionable whether the finding in lakes that nutrient concentrations at the 75th percentile of a reference population are similar to nutrient concentrations at the 25th percentile of the general population can be, unexamined, directly transferred to rivers and streams. The remaining case study (Tennessee) was undertaken in rivers and streams using an approach similar to ours. However, when the reference-to-general population nutrient relationship was examined for Tennessee's level III ecoregions, only three out of four of Tennessee's ecoregions showed a close match between the 75th percentile of reference and the 25th percentile of the general population (Appendix A; U.S. EPA, 2000b). Similarly, an analysis of reference and general-population nutrient data for small streams in parts of North Carolina and Tennessee shows that the 75th percentile of the reference distribution matches to about the 45th and 40th percentile of the general population for TN and TP, respectively (Rohm *et al.*, 2002).

The use of the 5th to 25th percentile of a general population frequency distribution to identify nutrient criteria is a secondary approach, to be used when

0005157

TABLE 8. Case-Study Nutrient Concentrations Mapped to Their Corresponding Percentile Value in the Reference Site Population Frequency Distributions.

Case Study	Nutrient	Case-Study Nutrient Concentration (mg/L)	Reference Stream Population: Season of Application	Reference Stream Population: Level III Ecoregion	Reference Stream Population: Percentile in Reference Distribution Matching Case-Study Concentration	Notes on Case Studies*
Welch *et al*. (1989)	SRP	0.010	Year Round	Northern Rockies	99	SRP concentration would constrain river distance with algal biomass exceeding 200 mg Chl *a* m^{-2} to under 10 km.
Watson *et al*. (1990)	SRP	0.011	Growing	Middle Rockies	94	Artificial stream study. SRP concentration corresponding to algal standing crop of 150 mg Chl *a* m^{-2}.
Dodds *et al*. (1997)	TN	0.275	Year Round	Middle Rockies	84	Based on regression equation, concentration is intended to maintain algal standing crop<100 mg Chl *a* m^{-2} (max).
	TP	0.035	Year Round	Middle Rockies	88	Based on regression equation, concentration is intended to maintain algal standing crop<100 mg Chl *a* m^{-2} (max).
Sosiak (2002)	TP	0.018	Year Round	Canadian Rockies	99	Based on regression equation, concentration intended to maintain algal standing crop<150 mg Chl *a* m^{-2} on the Bow River near Calgary, Alberta, Canada.†
Suplee (2004). Technical Report	$NO_2 + NO_3$	0.006	Growing	Northwestern Glaciated Plains	68	Based on nitrate-benthic algae regression equation, concentration would maintain maximum algal standing crop<150 mg Chl *a* m^{-2}.‡
	TN	1.04	Growing	Northwestern Glaciated Plains	73	Concentration extrapolated from $NO_2 + NO_3$ concentration.
	TP	0.153	Growing	Northwestern Glaciated Plains	83	Concentration extrapolated from $NO_2 + NO_3$ concentration.
				Mean:	86	
				Median:	86	
				1 SD:	11	
				CV (%):	13	

*Stream benthic algae densities above 100-150 mg Chl *a* m^{-2} are reported to exceed a nuisance threshold (Horner *et al*., 1983). Algae densities above 200 mg Chl *a* m^{-2} are reported to impact trout habitat (Biggs, 2000a).

†The Bow River at Calgary is downstream of the boundary of the level III ecoregion 'Canadian Rockies'. The Sosiak (2002) TP recommendation was assigned to the Canadian Rockies ecoregion since the majority of the river's drainage upstream of Calgary is within the Canadian Rockies ecoregion.

‡Additional data were collected at sites described in the Suplee (2004) report after the report was completed. Subsequent analysis of the larger dataset showed that 90% of the maximum algae densities in the reference sites were < 150 mg Chl *a* m^{-2}. Therefore, 150 mg Chl *a* m^{-2} was used to derive the $NO_2 + NO_3$ concentration shown here.

0005158

reference data are unavailable (U.S. EPA, 2000a). Our results and those of Rohm *et al.* (2002) demonstrate that caution should be taken when using this general-population approach to selecting criteria because, in effect, it creates a "moving target" because of its complete reliance upon the degree of eutrophication prevalent when the data were collected (Dodds and Oakes, 2004). If the ecoregion in question has not had a substantial degree of eutrophication, then the 25th percentile of the general population will result in overly restrictive criteria; Figure 4 demonstrates this point. In Figure 4, the reference and general population distributions for TN in the Northwestern Glaciated Plains of Montana overlap a great deal. The 75th percentile of the reference population maps to about the 63rd percentile of the general population, and so the general population 25th percentile represents an unduly restrictive criterion. The corollary to this is that in highly eutrophied regions, the general-population 25th percentile is probably not sufficiently protective of water beneficial uses. How one would go about systematically selecting more restrictive criteria (e.g., the 5th percentile) in the absence of reference sites, at least using these statistically based approaches, is not entirely clear in the U.S. EPA's guidance (U.S. EPA, 2000*b*).

Results from the present study also illustrate that it is not always easy to predict upfront, for any particular ecoregion, what the reference-to-general population relationship for any given nutrient will be. Prior to the analysis of Montana's data, we would have predicted — based on our general understanding of land use in Montana — that the prairie region east of the Rocky Mountain Front would have demonstrated a greater degree of elevated nutrients than the western, mountainous region of the state. The two prairie ecoregions comprising most of eastern Montana's land area (Northwestern Glaciated Plans and Northwestern Great Plains) are almost entirely used for grazing, dry-land agriculture (cereal crops such as wheat and barley) and, to a lesser degree, irrigated agriculture, and we assumed that nutrients in those ecoregions' streams would be highly elevated relative to their corresponding reference streams. However, we found that in these two ecoregions the reference and general-population nutrient concentrations were significantly different in only about a third of the cases (Table 7), much less often than was observed in the mountainous ecoregions of the state. There are four likely explanations for this: (1) the reference sites were poorly selected and actually represent eutrophied conditions; (2) most of the nutrients were sequestered by heavy growth of algae and aquatic plants and nutrient concentrations were, consequently, low; (3) not all nutrients are good indicators of regional eutrophication, and special attention should be paid to certain nutrient groups; or (4) the region — as a whole — is not as heavily eutrophied as initially thought.



FIGURE 4. Comparison of Total N Concentrations in Reference and Nonreference Stream Sites of the Northwestern Glaciated Plains Ecoregion in Montana. Data shown are for all seasons.

Of these four possibilities, the latter two are probably closest to the truth, and can be exemplified using the Northwestern Glaciated Plains ecoregion. To address the first possibility, two specific reference sites demonstrate the overall quality of the reference sites. The reference site "Rock Creek below Horse Creek, Near Int. Boundary" (USGS gauge station 06169500) is a USGS Hydrologic Benchmark Network (HBN) site located on the U.S.-Canadian border in the Northwestern Glaciated Plains ecoregion. The HBN network comprises stream sites located in relatively undeveloped basins which serve as controls for separating natural from human-caused changes in stream water quality (Alexander *et al.*, 1996; Clark *et al.*, 2000). Much of Rock Creek's watershed upstream of the site is contained within the Grasslands National Park of Canada (Parks Canada – Grasslands National Park of Canada, website, http://www.pc.gc.ca/pn-np/sk/grasslands, accessed October 21, 2005), and only about 7% is used for crop agriculture (U.S. and Canada combined). The reference site "Bitter Creek" (same ecoregion) has as its immediate upstream drainage a land area that has been described by the Montana Natural Heritage Program (a branch of the Nature Conservancy) as the largest intact grassland in northern Montana, and one of the most extensive naturally functioning glaciated plains grasslands in North America (Cooper *et al.*, 2001). Bitter Creek's drainage is not used for dry-land or irrigated agriculture, and grazing use of the area is highly compatible with natural ecological processes

0005159

that maintain grasslands of this type (Cooper *et al.*, 2001). These two stream sites are arguably as close to true reference as one is likely to find today in the Northern Great Plains. Available nutrient concentration data (all seasons) from these two sites were combined, and the 75th percentile of four nutrient groups — TN, TP, SRP and $NO_2 + NO_3$ — were matched to their corresponding general-population data in the Northwestern Glaciated Plains ecoregion. The four nutrient groups matched to the 84th, 78th, 58th, and 39th percentiles, respectively. As an aggregate, nutrient concentrations in Rock and Bitter creeks matched to the 65th percentile of the general population, lower than the percentile for the aggregate of all reference sites in the ecoregion (73rd; Table 5a) but clearly not at the 25th percentile. So even when nutrient data from the very best reference sites of the Northwestern Glaciated Plains ecoregion in Montana are examined, their frequency distributions overlap a great deal with the general population, which suggests that the general-population 25th percentile would represent too stringent criteria.

Regarding the second possibility, the winter season data do not support the assertion that nutrients were sequestered in dense growths of algae and aquatic plants. The winter season for the Northwestern Glaciated Plains (October 1st to March 14th; Table 3) occurs when aquatic plant growth has greatly slowed due to low light and freezing temperatures, and so the plant's ability to sequester nutrients and diminish water-column concentrations is negligible. Because soluble nutrients are most biologically available, they are probably the most sensitive measure of potential nutrient uptake by aquatic plants. In the winter season, the concentration at the 75th percentile of reference for ammonia, $NO_3 + NO_2$ and SRP matched to the 83rd, 75th, and 52nd percentiles of the general population (Table 5b). If general population streams were highly eutrophied and had heavy algal and aquatic plant growth taking up nutrients in the growing season, the plants' uptake would not be manifested in winter and one might expect soluble nutrient concentrations to become elevated in the winter season. The net result would be that reference site concentrations would match to much lower general-population percentiles (i.e., more like Figure 1) in winter than we observed.

Concerning the third possibility, note that $NO_3 + NO_2$ was significantly different between reference and nonreference sites in the Northwestern Glaciated Plains (Table 7). $NO_3 + NO_2$ is also, among the seven nutrient groups in Tables 5a and 5d, the nutrient showing the greatest separation from the 75th percentile of the reference sites. Suplee (2004) showed that $NO_3 + NO_2$ is significantly correlated to algae density in the region's streams, and another study in the ecoregion found that dryland crop-fallow practices elevate nitrate concentrations in soil porewater and groundwater (Nimick and Thamke, 1998). These facts suggest that special attention should be paid to this particular nutrient, as it is the one most likely to be linked to eutrophication problems in the region.

Finally, the fourth possibility can best be gauged relative to other parts of the state. In the mountainous ecoregions, which have forestry activities and also comprise intermountain valleys that have substantial agricultural activity, reference and nonreference streams were significantly different for many more nutrient groups than was found to be the case for the Northwestern Glaciated Plains. Furthermore, the reference 75th percentiles of the mountainous ecoregions mapped to much lower percentiles in their corresponding general populations than was observed in the Northwestern Glaciated Plains. So, relative to the mountainous region of the state, Northwestern Glaciated Plains nutrients are not as elevated, and there are fewer nutrient groups that are elevated. One is left to conclude that, in this prairie ecoregion of Montana, eutrophication is not as severe and is more nutrient-specific than in the western, mountainous part of the state.

The idea that the water quality of reference sites should be acceptable and support all beneficial water uses is fairly intuitive. This idea is intrinsic in the U.S. EPA's recommendation that the 75th percentile of a nutrient-concentration reference distribution be used to set criteria, because the 75th percentile will assure that the majority of the nutrient data from reference sites will not exceed the criteria thresholds. Nevertheless, the 75th percentile is still a cautious (i.e., protective) approach, as 25% of nutrient data collected from reference sites could exceed the criteria. Our results indicated that a somewhat higher percentile (about the 86th) from nutrient-concentration reference distributions is more appropriate for Montana streams, as this percentile has been ground truthed to regional case studies that demonstrate nutrient impacts to beneficial water-uses.

Impact-to-use nutrient concentrations (i.e., those at or above the 86th percentile of reference in the present study) are altogether different from "pristine" nutrient concentrations. Estimates of pristine nutrients concentrations in streams are reported in the literature, however (Kemp and Dodds, 2001; Smith *et al.*, 2003; Dodds and Oakes, 2004), and some of these concentrations can be compared with the present study. The best estimate of "pristine" from our study would be approximately the 50th percentile of reference, as it represents the central tendency for groups of reference sites. In the Central Cultivated Great Plains of the United States, pristine TN concentrations are estimated to range from 200 to 566 μg/l (Kemp and Dodds, 2001; Smith *et al.*, 2003; Dodds and Oakes, 2004), whereas this study suggests 760 μg/l (Northwestern Glaciated Plains; 50th percentile; Table 6a). Pristine TP concentrations for the same region range from 23 to 58 μg/l (Smith *et al.*, 2003; Dodds and Oakes, 2004), while this study suggests 60 μg/l (Table 6a). In the Western Forested Mountains of the United States, the results of this study are lower than other literature values. For example, in the Western Forested Mountains pristine concentrations range from 19 to 45 μg/l (Smith *et al.*, 2003; Dodds and Oakes, 2004), and this study suggests 3-10 μg/l (Northern, Middle and Canadian Rockies; Table 6a).

We acknowledge that in some regions of the United States (like Montana) the possibility of locating reference sites is much greater than in areas having widespread intensive agriculture (e.g., the U.S. corn belt). The process of identifying appropriate nutrient criteria in areas of intensive agriculture is clearly challenging, and although difficult to accomplish it would be prudent in such regions to try to locate at least a few reference sites, so that some sense of the reference-to-general population relationship can be developed. If this cannot be done, another approach would be to model the factors controlling a region's water quality and then factor out the affects of land use (e.g., Robertson *et al.*, 2001; Dodds and Oakes, 2004) or, alternatively, develop stressor-response models (e.g., Biggs, 2000b; Dodds *et al.*, 2002) between nutrients and demonstrable impacts to beneficial water uses.

In conclusion, our findings indicated that the relationship between nutrient concentrations in reference populations and nutrient concentrations in their corresponding general populations can vary a great deal from ecoregion to ecoregion. We found in this study that the 75th percentile of reference corresponded to the 4th to 97th percentile of the general population. Further, an expected relationship between reference and general population nutrient data — based on an *a priori* understanding of land use in a region — may not always manifest itself as anticipated. As a result, if the 25th percentile of a general-population frequency distribution is used to establish nutrient criteria, then the resulting nutrient standards could be overly stringent or insufficiently protective, depending upon what the actual relationship between the reference and the general population looks like. On the other hand, nutrient concentrations derived from five regionally applicable scientific studies (nutrient as stressor, impact to a beneficial water use as response) fell within a relatively narrow band around the 86th percentile of the reference-site nutrient frequency distributions. The latter result indicated that nutrient concentrations at high percentiles of reference-site frequency distributions (this study suggests the 86th) represent, fairly consistently, the threshold where impacts to beneficial water uses begin to occur.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Rosie Sada de Suplee of the Montana Department of Environmental Quality for having initiated the Reference Stream Project in 2000. Data from the Reference Stream Project were critical for the completion of the analyses discussed in this paper. Thanks to Vicki Watson and her students (University of Montana), who have assisted the Montana Department of Environmental Quality for many years with the Reference Stream Project and other nutrient-related studies. Thanks are also due to Chuck Hawkins (Utah State University) and Dave Peck (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) for providing nutrient data from their respective projects, and we would also like to acknowledge Barbara Rosenbaum (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) for providing stream-order values for the RF3 stream layer. A special thanks is also due to Jonathan Drygas (Montana Department of Environmental Quality) for compiling and organizing much of the nutrient and hydrological data. Funding for this project was provided by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Montana Department of Environmental Quality.

LITERATURE CITED

Alexander, R.B., A.S. Ludtke, K.K. Fitzgerald, and T.L. Schertz, 1996. Data From Selected U.S. Geological Survey National Stream Water-Quality Monitoring Networks (WQN) on CD-ROM. United States Geological Survey, Open-File Report 96-337. 79 p.

Bahls, L.L., B. Bukantis, and S. Tralles, 1992. Benchmark Biology of Montana Reference Streams. Montana Department of Health and Environmental Science, Helena, Montana. http://www.deq.-state.mt.us/wqinfo/monitoring/Publications/Loren_Paper.pdf *Accessed* October 3, 2005.

Barbour, M.T., J.M. Diamond, and C.O. Yoder, 1996. Biological Assessment Strategies: Applications and Limitations. In: *Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing: An Evaluation of Methods and Prediction of Receiving System Impacts*, D.R. Grothe, K.L. Dickson, and D.K. Reed-Judkins (Editors). SETAC Press, Pensacola, pp. 245-270.

Berglund, O., 2003. Periphyton Density Influences Organochlorine Accumulation in Rivers. *Limnology and Oceanography* 48:2106-2116.

Biggs, B.J.F, 2000a. New Zealand Periphyton Guideline: Detecting, Monitoring and Managing Enrichment in Streams. Prepared for the New Zealand Ministry of the Environment, Christchurch, 122 http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/water/nz-periphyton-guide-june00.html, *Accessed* October 5, 2005.

Biggs, B.J.F., 2000b. Eutrophication of Streams and Rivers: Dissolved Nutrient-Chlorophyll Relationships for Benthic Algae. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* 19:17-31.

Clark, G.M, D.K. Mueller, and M.A. Mast, 2000. Nutrient Concentrations and Yields in Undeveloped Stream Basins of the United States. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 36:849-860.

Clesceri, L.S., A.E. Greenberg, and A.D. Eaton (Editors), 1998. *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Waste-*

0005161

water, 20th Edition. American Public Health Association, Washington, District of Columbia.

Conover, W.J., 1999. *Practical Nonparametric Statistics*, 3rd Edition. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, USA.

Cooper, S.V., C. Jean, and P. Hendricks, 2001. Biological Survey of a Prairie Landscape in Montana's Glaciated Plains. Report to the Bureau of Land Management. Montana Natural Heritage Program, Helena, Montana. 24 pp. plus appendices. http://nhp.nris.mt.gov/plants/reports/bittercreek.pdf, *Accessed* November 1, 2005.

Dodds, W.K. and R.M. Oakes, 2004. A Technique for Establishing Reference Nutrient Concentrations Across Watersheds Affected by Humans. *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods* 2:333-341.

Dodds, W.K., V.H. Smith, and B. Zander, 1997. Developing Nutrient Targets to Control Benthic Chlorophyll Levels in Streams: A Case Study of the Clark Fork River. *Water Research* 31:1738-1750.

Dodds, W.K., V.H. Smith, and K. Lohman, 2002. Nitrogen and Phosphorus Relationships to Benthic Algal Biomass in Temperate Streams. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 59:865-874.

Freeman, M.C., 1986. The Role of Nitrogen and Phosphorus in the Development of *Cladophora Glomerata* (L.) Kutzing in the Manawatu River, New Zealand. *Hydrobiologia* 131:23-30.

Helsel, D.R. and R.M. Hirsch, 1992. *Statistical Methods in Water Resources*. Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Horne, A.J. and C.R. Goldman, 1994. *Limnology*, 2nd Edition. McGraw Hill Inc., New York, USA.

Horner, R.R, E.B. Welch, and R.B. Veenstra, 1983. Development of Nuisance Periphytic Algae in Laboratory Stream in Relation to Enrichment and Velocity. In:*Periphyton of Freshwater Ecosystems*, R.G. Wetzel (Editors). Dr. W. Junk Publishers, The Hague, pp. 121-134.

Hornung, R.W. and L.D. Reed, 1990. Estimation of Average Concentration in the Presence of Nondetectable Values. *Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene* 5:46-51.

Hughes, R.M., D.P. Larsen, and J.M. Omernik, 1986. Regional Reference Sites: a Method for Assessing Stream Potential. *Environmental Management* 5:629-635.

Johnson, L.B., C. Richards, G.E. Host, and J.W. Arthur, 1997. Landscape Influences on Water Chemistry in Midwestern Stream Ecosystems. *Freshwater Biology* 37:193-208.

Kemp, M.J. and W.K. Dodds, 2001. Spatial and Temporal Patterns of Nitrogen Concentrations in Pristine and Agriculturally-Influenced Prairie Streams. *Biogeochemistry* 53:125-141.

Kershner, J.L., B.B. Roper, N. Bouwes, R. Henderson, and E. Archer, 2004. An Analysis of Stream Habitat Conditions in Reference and Managed Watersheds on Some Federal Lands Within the Columbia River Basin. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 24:1363-1375.

Lazorchak, J.M., D.J. Klemm, and D.V. Peck, 1998. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program-Surface Waters: Field Operations and Methods for Measuring the Ecological Condition of Wadeable Streams*. United States Environmental Protection Agency, EPA/620/R-94/004F, Washington, District of Columbia. http://www.epa.gov/emap/html/pubs/docs/groupdocs/surfwatr/field/ws_abs.html, *Accessed* October 5, 2005.

Little, J.L., K.A. Saffran, and L. Fent, 2003. Land Use and Water Quality Relationships in the Lower Little Bow River Watershed, Alberta, Canada. *Water Quality Research Journal of Canada* 38:563-584.

Lohman, K. and J.C. Priscu, 1992. Physiological Indicators of Nutrient Deficiency in *Cladophora* (Chlorophyta) in the Clark Fork of the Columbia River, Montana. *Journal of Phycology* 28:443-448.

MT DEQ (Montana Department of Environmental Quality), 2006. Circular DEQ-7, Montana Numeric Water Quality Standards. February 2006 http://deq.mt.gov/wqinfo/Standards/Compiled-DEQ-7.pdf, *Accessed* March 5, 2006.

Mueller, D.K., P.A. Hamilton, D.R. Helsel, K.J. Hitt, and B.C. Ruddy, 1995. Nutrients in Ground Water and Surface Water of the United States —An Analysis of Data Through 1992. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigation Report 95-4031. Denver, Colorado, 74 pp.

NCDC (National Climate Data Center), 2006. Historic Palmer Drought Indices. http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/research/drought/palmer-maps/#overview.*Accessed* April 11, 2006.

Nimick, D.A. and J.N. Thamke, 1998. Extent, Magnitude, and Sources of Nitrate in the Flaxville and Underlaying Aquifers, Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Northeastern Montana. U.S. Geological Survey Water Resources Investigations Report 98-4079. Denver, Colorado, 45 p.

Ojima, D., L. Garcia, E. Elgaali, K. Miller, T.G.F. Kittel, and J. Lackett, 1999. Potential Climate Change Impacts on Water Resources in the Great Plains. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 35:1443-1454.

Omernik, J.M., 1977. *Nonpoint Source – Stream Nutrient Level Relationships: A Nationwide Study*. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Environmental Research Laboratory, EPA-600/3-77-105, Corvallis, Oregon.

Omernik, J.M., 1987. Ecoregions of the Conterminous United States. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 77:118-125.

Palmer, W.C, 1965. Meteorological Drought. Research Paper No. 45. U.S. Weather Bureau [NOAA Library and Information Services Division, Washington, District of Columbia 20852].

Richards, D.C., 1996. The Use of Aquatic Macroinvertebrates as Water Quality Indicators in Mountain Streams. M.S. Thesis, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana.

Robertson, D.M., A.S. Saad, and A.M. Wieben, 2001. An Alternative Regionalization Scheme for Defining Nutrient Criteria for Rivers and Streams. U.S. Geological SurveyWater-Resources Investigations Report 01–4073, 57 p.

Rohm, C.M., J.M. Omernik, A.J. Woods, and J.L. Stoddard, 2002. Regional Characteristics of Nutrient Concentrations in Streams and Their Application to Nutrient Criteria Development. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 38:213-239.

Seaber, P.R., F.P. Kapinos, and G.L. Knapp, 1987. Hydrologic Unit Maps. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 2294. 63 p.

Sheeder, S.A. and B.M. Evans, 2004. Estimating Nutrient and Sediment Threshold Criteria for Biological Impariment in Pennsylvania Watersheds. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 40:881-888.

Smith, R.A., R.B. Alexander, and G.E. Schwarz, 2003. Natural Background Concentrations of Nutrients in Streams and Rivers of the Conterminous United States. *Environmental Science and Technology* 37:3039-3047.

Snelder, T.H. and B.J.F. Biggs, 2002. Multiscale River Environment Classification for Water Resource Management. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 38:1225-1239.

Snelder, T.H., B.J.F. Biggs, and M.A. Weatherhead, 2004. Nutrient Concentration Criteria and Characterization of Patterns in Trophic State for Rivers in Heterogenous Landscapes. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 40:1-13.

Sosiak, A., 2002. Long-Term Response of Periphyton and Macrophytes to Reduced Municipal Nutrient Loading to the Bow River (Alberta, Canada). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 59:987-1001.

Strahler, A.N., 1964. Quantitative Geomorphology of Drainage Basins and Channel Networks. In: *Handbook of Applied Hydrology*, V.T. Chow (Editor). McGraw-Hill, New York, pp. 439-476.

Suplee, M., , 2004. Wadeable Streams of Montana's Hi-Line Region: An Analysis of Their Nature and Condition, With an Emphasis on Factors Affecting Aquatic Plant Communities and Recommendations to Prevent Nuisance Algae Conditions. Montana Department of Environmental Quality, 131 p. http://www.deq.state.mt.us/wqinfo/Standards/Master_Doc_DII.pdf *Accessed* April 10, 2006.

Suplee, M., R. Sada de Suplee, D. Feldman, and T. Laidlaw, , 2005. Identification and Assessment of Montana Reference Streams: A Follow-up and Expansion of the 1992 Benchmark Biology Study. Montana Department of Environmental Quality, Helena, Montana, 41 p, http://deq.mt.gov/wqinfo/Standards/Refsites_writeup_FINALPrintReady.pdf *Accessed* November 3, 2005.

U.S. EPA, 1979. *Methods for Chemical Analysis of Water and Wastes*. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Monitoring and Support Laboratory, Office of Research and Development, EPA-600/4-79-020, Cincinnati, Ohio. http://www.epa.gov/clariton/clhtml/pubtitleORD.html. *Accessed* September 7, 2004.

U.S. EPA, 1994. The U.S. EPA Reach File Version 3.0 Alpha Release (RF3-Alpha) Technical Reference. Prepared for the United States Environmental Protection Agency by Horizon Systems Corporation. http://www.epa.gov/waters/doc/techref.html

U.S. EPA, 1998. National Strategy for the Development of Regional Nutrient Criteria. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, EPA-822-R-98-002, Washington, District of Columbia. http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/criteria/nutrient/nutstra3.pdf. *Accessed* October 7, 2005.

U.S. EPA, 2000a. Ambient Water Quality Criteria Recommendations, Information Supporting the Development of State and Tribal Nutrient Criteria for Rivers and Streams in Nutrient Ecoregion II. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, EPA-822-B-00-015. Washington, District of Columbia. http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/criteria/nutrient/ecoregions/rivers/rivers_2.pdf. *Accessed* October 8, 2005.

U.S. EPA, 2000b. Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual, Rivers and Streams. United States Environmental Protection Agency, EPA-822-B00-002. Washington, District of Columbia. http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/criteria/nutrient/guidance/rivers/index.html. *Accessed* October 8, 2005.

U.S. EPA, 2000c. Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual, Lakes and Reservoirs. United States Environmental Protection Agency, EPA-822-B00-001. Washington, District of Columbia. http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/criteria/nutrient/guidance/lakes/index.html. *Accessed* October 8, 2005.

U.S. EPA, 2000d. Ambient Water Quality Criteria Recommendations, Information Supporting the Development of State and Tribal Nutrient Criteria for Lakes and Reservoirs in Nutrient Ecoregion II. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, EPA-822-B-00-007. Washington, District of Columbia http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/criteria/nutrient/ecoregions/lakes/lakes_2.pdf. *Accessed* October 8, 2005.

U.S. EPA, 2001. Ambient Water Quality Criteria Recommendations, Information Supporting the Development of State and Tribal Nutrient Criteria for Rivers and Streams in Nutrient Ecoregion IV. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, EPA-822-B-01-013. Washington, District of Columbia http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/criteria/nutrient/ecoregions/rivers/rivers_4.pdf. *Accessed* October 4, 2005.

U.S. EPA, 2006. Data Quality Assessment: Statistical Methods for Practitioners. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental Information, EPA/240/B-06/003., Washington, District of Columbia http://www.epa.gov/quality1/qs-docs/g9s-final.pdf. *Accessed* April 15, 2006.

Watson, V., P. Berlind, and L. Bahls, 1990. Control of Algal Standing Crop by P and N in the Clark Fork River. In: *Proceedings of the 1990 Clark Fork River Symposium*, V. Watson (Editor). University of Montana, Missoula, pp. 47-62. http://ibscore.dbs.umt.edu/clarkfork/Past_Proceedings/1990_proceedings/watson/Watson.htm. *Accessed* October 6, 2005.

Welch, E.B., 1992. *Ecological Effects of Wastewater*. Chapman and Hill, London, United Kingdom.

Welch, E.B., R.R. Horner, and C.R. Patmont, 1989. Prediction of Nuisance Periphytic Biomass: A Management Approach. *Water Research* 23:401-405.

Woods, A.J., J.M. Omernik, J.A. Nesser, J. Shelden, J.A. Comstock, and S.J. Azevedo, , 2002. *Ecoregions of Montana*, 2nd edition. (Color Poster with Map, Descriptive Text, Summary Tables, and Photographs): Reston, Virginia, U.S. Geological Survey (map scale 1:1,500,000).

0005163

APPENDIX A. List of USGS Gauge Stations Used to Define Flow Patterns of Level III Ecoregions in Montana.

USGS Station	Station Name	Flow Data Range	Years of Data	Ecoregion (III)
12354000	St Regis River near St. Regis, MT	1910-2003	94	15
12390700	Prospect Creek at Thompson Falls, MT	1956-2003	48	15
12389500	Thompson River near Thompson Falls, MT	1911-2003	93	15
12301999	Wolf Creek near Libby, MT	1967-77	11	15
12304500	Yaak River near Troy, MT	1956-2003	48	15
12366000	Whitefish River near Kalispell, MT	1928-2003	76	15
12301300	Tobacco River near Eureka, MT	1959-2003	45	15
12391550	Bull River near Noxon, MT	1973-82	10	15
12374250	Mill Creek above Bassoo Creek, near Niarada, MT	1982-2003	22	15
12300500	Fortine Creek near Trego, Mt	1947-53	7	15
12351500	Lolo Creek near Lolo, MT	1911-15	5	15
12388400	Revais Creek below West Fork near Dixon, MT	1983-2003	21	15
12343400	East Fork Bitterroot near Conner, MT	1956-2003	48	16
06024500	Trail Creek Near Wisdom, MT	1948-72	25	16
12345000	Rock Creek near Darby, MT	1946-59	14	16
12347500	Blodgett Creek near Corvallis, MT	1947-69	23	16
12349500	Fred Burr Creek near Victor, MT	1947-51	5	16
12350500	Kootenai Creek near Stevensville, MT	1949-63	15	16
12381400	South Fork Jocko River near Arlee, MT	1982-2003	22	17
12332000	Middle Fork Rock Creek near Philipsburg, MT	1938-2003	66	17
06015500	Grasshopper Creek near Dillon, MT	1921-61	41	17
06013500	Big Sheep Creek below Muddy Creek near Dell, MT	1936-79	44	17
06037500	Madison River near West Yellowstone, MT	1913-2001	89	17
06209500	Rock Creek near Red Lodge, MT	1932-2003	72	17
06035000	Willow Creek near Harrison, MT	1938-2002	65	17
06055500	Crow Creek near Radersburg, MT	1901-90	90	17
06071000	Little Prickly Pear Creek near Canyon Creek, MT	1909-24	16	17
06077000	Sheep Creek near White Sulphur Springs, MT	1941-72	32	17
06154410	Little Peoples Creek near Hays, MT	1972-89	18	17
06207540	Silver Tip Creek near Belfry, MT	1967-75	9	18
06207500	Clarks Fork Yellowstone River near Belfry, MT	1921-2003	83	18
06207510	Big Sand Cl at WY-MONT State line	1973-81	9	18
06078500	North Fork Sun River near Augusta, MT	1911-93	83	41
05011500	Waterton River near International Boundary	1947-64	18	41
12359000	South Fork Flathead River at SBRS, near Hungry Horse, MT	1948-67	20	41
12361000	Sullivan Creek near Hungry Horse, MT	1948-76	29	41
12357000	Middle Fork Flathead at Essex, MT	1940-64	25	41
12355500	North Fork Flathead near Columbia Falls, MT	1910-2003	94	41
05010000	Belly River at International Boundary	1947-64	18	41
12382000	Middle Fork Jocko River near Jocko, MT	1912-16	5	41
05014500	Swiftcurrent Creek at Many Glacier, MT	1912-2002	91	41
06072000	Dearborn River AB Falls Creek, near Clemons, MT	1908-12	5	41
06180000	West Fork Poplar River near Richland	1935-49	15	42
06168500	Rock Creek at International Boundary	1914-61	48	42
06142400	Clear Creek near Chinook, MT	1984-2002	19	42
06154400	Peoples Creek near Hays, MT	1966-2003	38	42
06176500	Wolf Creek near Wolf Point, MT	1908-92	85	42
06185110	Big Muddy Creek near mouth near Culbertson, MT	1981-92	12	42
06183800	Cottonwood Creek near Dagmar, Mt	1985-2003	19	42
06170200	Willow Creek near Hisdale, MT	1965-73	9	42
06099000	Cut Bank Creek at Cut Bank, MT	1905-2003	99	42
06133500	North Fork Milk River AB St. Mary Ca near Browning, MT	1911-2002	92	42
06107000	North Fork Muddy Creek near Bynum, MT	1912-24	13	42
06129500	McDonald Creek at Winnett, MT	1930-56	27	43
06336500	Beaver Creek at Wibaux, MT	1938-84	47	43
06307600	Hanging Woman Creek near Birney, MT	1973-95	23	43
06126470	Halfbreed Creek near Klein, MT	1978-91	14	43
06121000	American Fork near Harlowton, MT	1907-32	26	43
06111000	Ross Fork Creek near Hobson, MT	1946-62	17	43
06294995	Armells Creek near Forsyth, MT	1974-95	22	43
06287500	Soap Creek near St. Xavier, MT	1911-72	62	43
06324500	Powder River at Moorhead, MT	1929-2003	75	43
06334000	Little Missouri River near Alzada, MT	1911-69	59	43

0005164